



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

SOME VERY PERTINENT REMARKS ON TOLLER'S
SUPPLEMENT TO BOSWORTH-TOLLER'S ANGLO-
SAXON DICTIONARY.

I have been following with a great deal of attention the work of revising and enlarging his edition of Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Prof. Northcote Toller is performing in the supplement to that work and has now carried as far as *Geolwe* in the two parts issued. In the course of my researches I have had an opportunity to examine somewhat closely these parts and I feel impelled to offer, in a spirit of helpfulness, the following remarks which are prompted by my deep interest in the subject.

If it is the aim of the reviser to make the Bosworth-Toller a storehouse of reliable information as to Old English word material actually preserved, I am very much afraid the present method of presentation, if persisted in, will not only deprive the Dictionary of a good deal of its usefulness and trustworthiness, but to some extent will prove to be harmful to the interests of Old English. In saying this I refer, in the first place, to the practice of reducing the quotations to a more or less uniform standard of accentuation and spelling not warranted by MS. evidence; in the second place, I refer to the pernicious habit of quoting vouchers for words booked from editions of texts either antiquated or downright unreliable, when more modern and critical editions are at hand for the purpose. For example, one is fairly amazed to meet in the Supplement with quotations from "Ps. Srt.," which is Prof. Toller's abbreviation for "An Anglo-Saxon Psalter (printed from MS. Cotton, Vespasian A. 1), edited by J. Stevenson, Surtees Society, Nos. 16, 19, 1843-1847." Now this is the Psalter, widely known as the Vespasian Psalter, ever since in 1885 H. Sweet incorporated it in his edition of *The Oldest English Texts*. On page 187 of this work Mr. Sweet says of Stevenson's text that it "abounds with such gross blunders" and deviates from the MS. in certain instances so deliberately as to make this edition "a disgrace to English scholarship." I do not know that a dissenting voice has been raised against such a sweeping condemnation. Certain it is that from 1885 on scholars have been careful to leave Stevenson's edition aside and quote from that of Sweet, and the Psalter is generally referred to as the Vespasian Psalter. Yet, the Supplement takes slight note of this general practice and continues quoting from Stevenson's unreliable text as the Dictionary did.¹ How unreliable this text is may be seen from the quotations in the Supplement sub *ā-bīdan*

¹ In the table of explanations prefixed to part I of the Supplement, I find sub "Additional Contractions" Ps. V. = The Vespasian Psalter, in *O. E. Texts*, edited by H. Sweet. It would seem, then, that Sweet's edition is occasionally quoted from. So far, however, I have not met with a single instance.

and *deōfol*. For the former we find as last instance from Ps. Srt. 26, 14, *Ab̄d dryht* 'exspecta Dominum, sustine Dominum.' For the latter, under section II b, *Alle godas ðioda diōful* 'omnes dii gentium daemonia' from Ps. Srt. 95, 5 is proffered. If we turn to Sweet's edition of the Vespasian Psalter, we learn that *dryht* is Stevenson's inaccuracy for the MS.'s *dryht*'=*dryhten*, and *diōful* for the MS.'s *ðioful*. Further the Supplement helps to perpetuate regrettable blunders by quoting sub *ascirpan* from Ps. Srt. 63, 4 *ascearptun* instead of the correct *āscerptun* from Sweet.

I cannot, at present, show that perpetuation of blunders has resulted from the Supplement's persistence in quoting from the antiquated edition of Old English Vocabularies by Thomas Wright 1857 and 1873 rather than from the second edition by Richard Paul Wülcker, London 1884, but I can testify to the irritation a scholar is subjected to by the Supplement's practice which is utterly at variance with the practice followed by other scholars, notably by those of the New English Dictionary, who have found it expedient to use Wülcker's edition for the quotation of glosses, although even that edition does not come up to our present requirements of accuracy and fidelity to MS. evidence. And there are cases where the Supplement can just as little help quoting from Wright-Wülcker as the Dictionary could help in certain instances.¹ So, for example, sub *ganra* the Supplement has to turn to that edition for its additional quotation. It is credited there to "Wülck. Gloss. 284, 12." The uninitiated reader will have some difficulty in finding out what this abbreviation means. The designation Wright-Wülcker Voc. I 284, 12 would have been more exact and in keeping with the practice of other scholars.

For a good many words hitherto not recorded or for further illustrations of words recorded, the Supplement draws largely on the charters, as indeed is meet and proper, these documents being a mine of Old English word material altogether too long neglected by lexicographers, though J. Kemble's six volumes of his *Codex Diplomaticus* were published as early as 1839-1848. On this first publication of the charters the Dictionary no less than the Supplement bases its quotations, though there are occasional quotations from the *Cartularium Saxonum* by Walter de Gray Birch, London 1883-1893 and from B. Thorpe's *Diplomatarium Aevi Saxonici*, London 1865 or John Earle's *Handbook to the Land Charters and other Saxon Documents*, Oxford 1888. Now, though Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus* is a monumental work in its way, "justly celebrated for the greatness of its conception and general effect," yet, as Mr. Birch points out, it is unfortunately marred by several offences against the present standard of literary work. In the first place, the texts themselves are in a large proportion of cases edited incorrectly, and that, in some instances, to a

¹ See sub *webwyrhta*, *wīnbēam*, *wōlewistle*, *wraþu*, *wraþstudu*, *wrecan*.

serious extent. In the second place, a goodly number of charters published in the first three volumes lack what is for the student of Old English the most important part, the vernacular description of boundaries. In the appendix to the third and sixth volumes Kemble has tried to make up for the omission by printing as many of these parts as he could gather, but the number is still incomplete and every user of the *Codex Diplomaticus* should bear this in mind, if he wants to avoid confusion.¹ In the third place, only in certain instances Kemble abstains to meddle with the accents of the MS. As a rule, he has introduced accents wherever he thought they were necessary to indicate vowel length, and on the other hand he has, here and there, omitted those MS. accents he thought were wrong. As a consequence, his edition is fairly worthless for a study of MS. accents in the charters. Birch, in his strictures on Kemble's edition, lays no stress on this point, in fact, does not mention it. I consider it a very misleading feature of that edition in the same way as I consider the introduction of accents into the quotations of the Supplement a practice against which I cannot raise my voice loud enough.

Due stress is laid by Birch on the fact that Kemble's texts, when examined by the light of the originals, show wide differences in the employment of *ð* and *þ*, contrary to the archetypal MS. As a consequence, most, if not all of the Supplement's quotations from Kemble are vitiated by this inaccuracy. So, for example, what the Supplement exhibits sub *flit-gāra* from C.D. V 217, 15, 22 should read, according to Birch's *Cartularium* II 409, 6th line f.b. and *ibid.* II 410³ . . . *on þone flit garan. of þam flit garan . . . on þonæ flit garan.* For what the Supplement prints sub *east-stæþ* from C.D. V.216, 35 should read, according to B.C. I. 409²⁴ *of afe nan east staðæ*. Observe the MS.'s accent over *o* of the first word and the parts of the compound kept separate. But not only with regard to the accents and the use of *ð* and *þ* is Kemble's edition and the Supplement following it inaccurate; there are other inaccuracies just as well. So the *cwalm-* of *cwalmstōwe* contained in the quotation from C.D. III 404, 27 is nothing but a blunder of Kemble for *cwealm-* which the Supplement gives as various reading, evidently, from Earle's *Handbook*, p. 290²⁹, while in fact it is just the MS.'s reading, according to B.C. II 284.

The quotation in the Supplement for *ælfisc* from C.D. III 61, 5 should be replaced by the following from B.C. III 561, 23 ff., which is from the original MS., *7 ic þa ge eacnode.² to þære ærran sylene tyn þusende elfixa ælce geara þam munecum.* Sub *flæsc* and *forgenge* the same passage of a certain charter is quoted in the Supplement from two different editions, with the result that under the latter word the quotation taken from Thorpe's *Diplomatarium* comes nearest to the MS. text, while what is printed sub *flæsc* from

¹ Birch, as rule, points out the omissions, but occasionally fails to do so.

² Evidently by a misprint Birch has *acnode*; the MS. has plainly *eacnode*.

C.D. V 164, 32, is vitiated by Kemble's inaccuracies. Under both headings the passage should read as printed in Birch Cart. II 290, 3-4: *gyf hit on lencten ge byrtige þ þæ þonne þære flæscun ge weorð on fisce gestriene buton þ þis forgenge ste.* Observe the MS. accents whose presence is entirely obfuscated by the Supplement's practice of printing quotations. Observe also the peculiar form of the gen. pl. *flæscun*, not adverted to in the Supplement. It has its par in *munekan* and *clerican* attested to by the 10th century charter of Eadgar, B.C. III 381¹⁵ = Thorpe p. 215⁷, of *þære munekan anwalde eft on clerican hand getyrnað.* Thorpe, to mention this in passing by, marks the charter as spurious by the affixion of an asterisk; Birch, however, does not seem to doubt its genuineness. At any rate, he is silent on that point.

As to the last quotation in the Supplement for *efes*, *efesc* from C.D. V 184, 11, 13, it should be noted that the *æfisc*, *efisc* exhibited in brackets, evidently as variant readings of *æfise*, *efise*, from Birch's Cart. II 304, is actually the true reading of the MS., while *æfise*, *efise* is in this instance a mere inaccuracy of Kemble's print, or may be a deliberate deviation from the MS. It is worth while mentioning, too, that in the above quotation the Supplement omits *sceafles* between *Innan* and *hangran*, without marking the place of omission. A similar omission is left unmarked in the quotation for *âdfynig* from C.D. V 194, 2 after *éastan* and after *pyte*. The whole passage ought to be correctly quoted from B.C. II 357, 7th l.f.b., thus: *be eastan bunteles pyte forð to þam ealdan ad fini. of þam finie up to þam ealdan ele beâme.* The last sentence of this passage is quoted sub *elebeâm* from C.D. V 194, 3 with the result that the Supplement propagates Kemble's unwarranted *ðâm* for the *þam* of the MS.

Notice also that the *bleð-*, exhibited in brackets after *blædhorn* in the quotation from Thorpe p. 559, 29 sub *blædhorn*, is not, as the uninitiated might suppose, a variant, but a mere blunder of Kemble's print C.D. III 362, 22. The MS. has clearly *blæd horn*, as Sanders' facsimile shows (Ordnance Survey Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon MSS. part III, plate 38). In a quotation from C.D. III 61, 12 sub *begitan* the Supplement takes note in the brackets after *begytene* of a difference in the text as printed by Birch Cart. III 561, 29, in such a way as to give the uninitiated the impression that Birch's *betytene* must be the editor's or printer's mistake for *begytene*. As a matter of fact, however, it is the undoubted reading of the MS. and ought to have been characterized as such. I have taken the trouble to closely examine the facsimile (Ordn. Survey Facs. of Anglo-Saxon MSS., Part III, Plate 32) at that place and find Mr. Birch's print correct. The scribe evidently wrote a *t* for a *g*. And the establishment of such scribal errors in the MS. is of importance. Kemble's *begytene* is, of course, the proper emendation of it, but attention ought to have been drawn to the

fact of its being emendation. His substitution of *ð* for *þ* in three instance is again unwarranted and ought not to have been followed in the Supplement. The passage should be exhibited thus from B.C. III 561, 29: *þa socna þe into þam mynstre nu synt betylene* (so MS. for *begylene*).

In the quotation from C.D. III 383, 11, which is found in the Supplement sub *edisc*, Ad illum agellum qui dicitur *Tatan edisc*, I wonder whether there has not been a mixing up of sources. Certain it is that the passage as exhibited is printed so by Birch Cart. III 383, 11, while Kemble has [qð] for *qui*, *dicit* for *dicitur* and *tatan* for *Tatan*. Without doubt, the passage quoted sub *forsæðan* (?) and charged to C.D. II 245, 26 is in point of fact taken from Birch Cart. II 245, 26. It would seem that the similarity of abbreviation for the Codex Diplomaticus (C.D.) with that for Birch's Cartularium (B.C.D.) is responsible for the mistake. As the title of Birch's work hardly lends itself to the abbreviation chosen for its designation, we may fairly wonder why it was chosen; B.C. would be preferable.

For the sake of brevity the Supplement often indulges in the shortening of passages in consequence of which slight changes of the text are necessitated here and there. These changes are permissible if they are properly marked. I have noted the following instances where they are not properly marked: Sub *abbodleást* the desired brevity and the necessary accuracy would both have been served if the passage from B.C.D. (Birch's Cartularium) I 155, 37 were quoted thus: *þ nan lyre . . . acume on þa lare . . . [ne] my[nstr]es þing forwyrþan for abbudleaste* 'ut non detrimentum . . . disciplina incurrat vel res monasterii abbatis privatione depereant.' The bracketed letters indicate illegible places in the MS. Sub *ætstrengan* also a change has been indulged in without making the reader aware of it. Accuracy and brevity would both be served if the passage from Thorpe LL I 270, 21 = Birch Cart. III 383 were quoted thus: *Gif he [sc. se hlaford] þonne gelomlice his gafoles myngað and . . he [sc. geneat manna hwylc] þonne aheardað and hit þencð to ætstrengenne*. Still worse is the change without warning in the quotation from C.D. V 153, 19-154, 1 sub *gâr-acer*. Kemble's *ðân gârâceras* appears there changed to *ðâ gârâceras*. According to B.C. II 255 the MS. has clearly *þan g.*, but the variant *þa* is supplied by another MS. to which attention ought to have been drawn. Also the Supplement's *gârâcer[um]* for Kemble's *gârâcer* (*gar âcer* MS.) was anticipated by a MS. variant *âceron* which might have been mentioned. For K.'s *ðæt land* and *ðæt andlanges ðære fyrh* substitute the MS.'s *þ land* and *þ andlanges þære fyrh*. Also sub *âcer-mælum* the quotation from C.D. VI 98, 5 might with profit be printed more correctly thus from B.C. III 562: *þæt þonne* (sc. *land*) *lið hið mælum and âcer mælum*. In the following quotation, charged sub *æðfe* to

Thorpe's *Diplomatarium* p. 230, 16, I do not know whether the discrepancy from Th.'s print is due to arbitrary change of spelling or because the passage is actually taken from C.D. III 125, 13. At any rate, only Kemble prints the second sentence of the quotation the way it is exhibited in the Supplement, apart from his *ðæt* appearing there as *ðet*. Thorpe certainly has plainly: *7 þ werð æreafe*. In the preceding sentence of the quotation note that the Supplement leaves out two words of the text without indicating the omission and otherwise unnecessarily shortens the sentence. I can see no reason why the full sentence as Thorpe prints it should not have been given: *forþan þe hi* (sc. mother and son) *drifon [i]serne stacan on Alsie Wulfstanes feder*. The omitted *[i]serne* is a very essential part for the proper understanding of the interesting passage nor has it been left out in the Dictionary sub *staca* where the same passage is quoted and commented upon. To the information conveyed there concerning this method of witchcraft reference ought to have been made and the reader ought to have been told that *iserne* printed sub *staca* should read *[i]serne*, the MS. having *serne*; *iserne* is Kemble's emendation which Thorpe failed to credit to its author. For *An wyduwe and hire sune* in the quotation sub *staca* substitute: *Hi* [sc. *an wyduwe and hire sune*].

Of blunders committed in the Dictionary, but not rectified in the Supplement I have noticed the following instances: Sub *a-fýran* the Dictionary has this as first quotation: "*Afýred olfend* 'a dromedary, a kind of swift camel'; dromeda MS." No source of the quotation is indicated nor is there indeed any proper base for it. It is simply a mixture of two glosses, *Corpus Glossary* ed. Hessels, D 361, *Dromidus, afýred olbenda*, and *Ælfric's Vocabulary*, Wright-Wülcker I 119, 7 *Camelus uel dromeda. olfend*.³ Of this state of things the Supplement ought to have duly informed the reader. All it does, however, is to quote the *Corpus* gloss from Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, without any comment, sub *áfýran* and add in brackets the reading of the Erfurt, *afýrid*, without, however, telling the reader so. Nor is the reader put in possession of the fact that the *Corpus* gloss reappears again in the 11th century collection of glosses in MS. Cotton, Cleopatra A III, Wright-Wülcker I 385, 39, *Dromidus, ofýrit olfenda*.⁴ The omission of this gloss sub *áfýran* is all the more regrettable since it affords proof for the transition of long *a* to *o*.⁵ It ought to be entered under the letter O and preliminary attention should be drawn to *o-fýrid* here.—From the foregoing it is plain that the entry *áfýran* in the Supplement ought to have been preceded by the following correction: '*A-fýran*—MS. Dele and substitute *áfýran* etc.' Just so the wrong *a-bredan* of the Dictionary ought to be adverted to as rectius legendum *â-brêdan* and with its quotations referred to

³ Quoted in the Dictionary sub *olfend*.

⁴ Quoted in the Dictionary sub *olfend*.

⁵ As to that transition, compare *olfata* 'cocula,' Wright-Wülcker I 122, 35.

Ā-bregdan. The entry in the Supplement "*Āslæccan*. Add: *Āslæcte* dissolverat Wrt. Voc. II 25, 58. *Āscæltte* 106, 56" does not take cognizance of the fact that the Dictionary exhibits *a-slæccan* and that its basis is just the one gloss from Codex Cotton, Cleopatra. A III (Wright-Wülcker I 385, 30) which the Supplement quotes from Wrt. Voc. II 25, 58. It is refashioning of the Corpus Gloss (Hessels) D 336 which the Supplement quotes next from Wrt. Voc. II 105, 56, evidently supposing that *ascaeltte* (so, not *ascæltte* has the MS.) stands for *aslæcte*. For that, without doubt, it has been taken by the scribe of the Cleopatra collection. But it is by no means certain that he was right. *Ascaeltte* of the Corpus may represent *ascaelcte* and presuppose an Old English *ā-scælcan*, which was no longer known to the later scribe, but which may be connected with East Frisian *ver-schalcken*=*verzäpfen*, *verzähnen*.

A very serious blunder of the Dictionary not corrected in the Supplement is the entry on page 114, *bōc-scyld* 'a beechen shield,' for which the following quotation from Thorpe p. 561, 5 is brought forward: *Ic ge-an* [MS. *geann*] *Siferþe mīnes bōcscylde*. Here observe, in the first place, that the text quoted is again shortened without proper indication and the spelling unwarrantedly meddled with. The full sentence reads thus in Thorpe: **7** *ic geann Siferðe þæs landes at Hocganclife 7 anes swurdes. 7 anes horses. 7 mines boc scylde*. In a foot-note to the last word, *boc scylde*, Thorpe asserts this to be the reading of the Cod. Wintoniensis, adding that "Manning (App. ad Lye) reads *boh-scyld*, from *boh*, humerus, i.e., a shield borne on the shoulder, scutum humerale." As a matter of fact, Manning's *boh-scyldes* is the reading not only of the Winchester MS., but also that of the Canterbury MS. For the charter of Athelstan Ætheling happens to be preserved to us in the two MSS. mentioned and that in the Canterbury MS. is, to my mind, a copy of that in the Winchester MS., though Sanders, the editor of both (Ordnance Survey Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon MSS., part III, plate 38 and part I, plate 18) does not seem to be aware of it. I shall deal with the subject more fully in a special article. Here it suffice to say that *bohscylde* is undoubtedly the reading of both MSS. and Thorpe's *boc scylde* is mere repetition of Kemble's blunder (C.D. V 363, 14). While Manning-Kemble-Thorpe's print is based on the Winchester MS., Earle's print p. 224 represents the text of the Canterbury MS. which, as Sanders says, "differs slightly" from the Winchester text. But, as pointed out, *bohscylde* is in both MSS. Consequently the Supplement ought to exhibit the following rectification of the Dictionary: *Bōc-scyld* . lege *bōhscyld*:—**7** *ic geann* (so MS.) *Siferðe . . . mines bohscylde* (Sanders, Ordnance Survey Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon MSS., part III, 38 and part I, 38).

(To be continued)

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford, Conn., September 1918.